Application No. Applicant(s) 09/761,779 AKASAKA ET AL. Interview Summary Examiner Art Unit 2155 **Kevin Bates** All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel): (1) Kevin Bates. (2) James Livingston. Date of Interview: 09 April 2007. Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference c)⊠ Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e)⊠ No. If Yes, brief description: _____. Claim(s) discussed: 1. Identification of prior art discussed: Herr-Hoyman. Agreement with respect to the claims fi was reached. g) was not reached. h) \times N/A. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The examiner and applicant discussed the claimed invention and prior art on record and the applicant proposed possible amendments that distuingished the invention over the prior art of record and that would be adventagous to the prosecution.. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet. Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an

Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required